



**SCOTTSDALE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
KIVA - CITY HALL
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD
FEBRUARY 2, 2006
DRAFT STUDY SESSION MINUTES**

PRESENT: Wayne Ecton, Council Member
E.L. Cortez, Design Member
Jeremy A. Jones, Vice-Chairman
Michael D'Andrea, Development Member
Kevin O'Neill, Development Member
Jeffrey Schwartz, Commissioner

ABSENT: Michael Schmitt, Design Member

STAFF: Donna Bronski
Mac Cummins
Tim Curtis
Kroy Ekblaw
Lusia Galav
Randy Grant
Dan Symer
Al Ward

CALL TO ORDER

The study session of the Scottsdale Development Review Board was called to order by Councilman Ecton at 12:24 p.m.

REVIEW DRB CASES

CONSENT AGENDA

3. 71-DR-2005 Classic Car Spa

Lusia Galav requested that this item be moved to the regular agenda in order for staff to make a presentation.

4. 75-DR-2005 Casa Del Encanto

Mac Cummins presented a photograph of the existing building with a proposed second floor photo simulated onto the building. He clarified for Board Member O'Neill that the new section starts with the railing as depicted on the second floor.

Vice-Chairman Jones, noting that he likes the general color approach, suggested that the Applicant be permitted to tone down the color a little. Mr. Cummins noted that the color shown is the existing color.

Ms. Galav requested that the Board review 71-DR-2005, noting an earlier mistake when staff requested that the item be moved to the regular agenda.

3. 71-DR-2005 Classic Car Wash

Ms. Galav commented that Applicant responded to comments concerning design made by Councilwoman Drake when the application was before Council for their use permit. She noted that the staff report reflects the revisions.

Board Member O'Neill inquired concerning an inconsistency between the design of the gas canopies on the site plan and the landscaping plan. Mr. Williams explained that Applicant was requested to stagger the canopies, and this is not yet reflected in the landscaping plan. Board Members reviewed the materials board.

In response to a comment by Commissioner Schwartz, Mr. Williams reported that staff is revising the submittal application in order to improve the quality of the materials boards. Commissioner Schwartz suggested that the Applicant be asked to return at a later date with an accurate color board that ties to the submittal.

Board Member D'Andrea expressed concern about the queuing line beginning just off of Scottsdale Road. Mr. Williams noted that the Department of Transportation approved a queuing of seven cars and that according to the site plan there would be room for another six vehicles before backing up onto Scottsdale Road.

In response to an inquiry by Councilman Ecton about the location of the gas pumps and the flow of traffic, Mr. Williams referred him to the Applicant. Councilman Ecton requested that this item be moved to the regular agenda.

5. 92-DR-2005 Big O Tire Store

Ms. Galav noted that staff would like for this item to be moved to the regular agenda. Councilman Ecton commented that he would like to have some discussion in order to identify any specific questions from the Board.

Vice-Chairman Jones expressed a concern about the design, noting that it lacks visual organization. He suggested that without increasing costs the building could be separated into three distinct masses. He requested that the presentation include how the design might be simplified into distinct breaks and how the front office could be shifted to strengthen the design.

Mac Cummins confirmed for Board Member O'Neill that the site the Board is concerned with is the rectangular site east of the corner on the site plan. He noted that staff presented both the site and the neighboring parcel because they share drive access and parking.

Commissioner Schwartz commented that they presented an appropriate color board.

REGULAR AGENDA

33-DR-2003#2

Main Street Phase II – Courtyard @ Main

Ms. Galav reported that the changes contained in the amended stipulations received by the Board were the removal of engineering stipulations that were not applicable to the case.

Councilman Ecton noted that he would be recusing himself from this issue, because he will be living in Main Street Phase I.

Vice-Chairman Jones referred to the introduction paragraph under zoning in the amended stipulations and asked for a review of the originally requested modifications made by Applicant to City Council.

In response to Vice-Chairman Jones, Randy Grant presented an illustration depicting all four phases of the project. He reported that the plan block development in the zoning ordinance gives flexibility in amending standards and transferring density between portions of the site. He noted that there was an extensive package approved by City Council that went with the development agreement that covered the modifications.

Susan Bitter-Smith, representing the Applicant, explained to the Board that modifications were due to square footage issues and went back to City Council because they were part of the development agreement. She confirmed for Vice-Chairman Jones that the changes were great improvements.

Commissioner Schwartz noted that he has no problem taking this item to consent. He commented that he appreciated that the landscaping design was in scale with the architecture.

In response to Board Member Cortez, Randy Grant confirmed that the color and design had been changed since the last time this application came through the Development Review Board. He noted that there have been changes in the massing, color and overall architecture; the style is now more contemporary. Board Member Cortez noted that he appreciates the new design and would be in support of the application.

Vice-Chairman Jones reported that it is the consensus of the Board that the item be moved to the consent agenda.

STUDY SESSION

1. Stadium Scoreboards

Kroy Ekblaw addressed the Board. Highlights of his presentation included an illustration of the new scoreboard which will be thirty-five feet in height and includes a video section with signage on both sides; the top of the sign will say "Scottsdale Stadium" and "Home of the Giants". He explained at what vantage points the sign will be visible from outside the stadium. Mr. Ekblaw reviewed the Indian School Park Phase II improvements information which will be covered in his presentation at the next meeting of the Development Review Board.

Board Member D'Andrea commented on the great job that has been done on this project and pointed out that the nets are almost invisible.

Councilman Ecton commented that he enjoyed the stadium tour the Board attended in January.

2. 85-DR-2005 Pacific Realty Advisors

Ms. Galav noted that the materials board and elevations have been brought back by Applicant in an acceptable format.

In response to inquiry by Vice-Chairman Jones, Mr. West clarified that the darker of the two light shades on the color board was the mullion color.

Commissioner Schwartz and Board Member D'Andrea thanked Mr. West for bringing in such a nice color board.

3. DRB Duties and Responsibilities Discussion

Mr. Gray stated that the City Council would like to know if the Development Review Board feels that the duties and responsibilities as outlined reflect what they are actually doing. He noted that he would like the Board Members to review what was anticipated of the Board and then he will take any suggestions or adjustments they envision back to the Committee of the Council that is working on this issue.

Mr. Gray then read the duties and responsibilities section of the Code to the Board Members. Noting that there are exceptions for administrative review, Mr. Gray read the administrative review section of the Code. He clarified that the administrative review section noted that the Development Review Board is an appeal board in the case of administrative decisions. He noted that the City Council can, at its digression, hear a DRB case and they would be the ultimate authority in that decision-making process.

Vice-Chairman Jones remarked that a key element is determination of what constitutes a minor addition which would be decided administratively. He opined that there have been many times that cases have come to the DRB that were relatively small and compatible with the building. He wondered if there could be a guideline set for making decisions about those cases before they got to that level.

Mr. Gray suggested that minor changes and additions continue to be made administratively, with the Board receiving a notice of determination at each meeting. He noted that the Board Members could then review the decisions that are being made and make any recommendations. He agreed that there are many items that should not be coming to Development Review Board.

In response to inquiry by Vice-Chairman Jones, Ms. Bronski stated that she would research the issue of whether or not the City Council Member sitting on the Development Review Board could vote on DRB issues according to Code. Vice-Chairman Jones clarified that it has been customary for the Council Member to participate in voting and suggested that the wording be improved.

Mr. Gray clarified for Board Member O'Neill that the City Council can initiate to themselves any power that the DRB has. As the DRB is a board of the Council, Council can review any case.

Study session adjourned at 1:05 p.m. to commence the regular meeting and reconvened at 2:36 p.m.

In answer to the question posed by Vice-Chairman Jones, Ms. Bronski reported that the bylaws state that all Board members are voting members.

Board Member D'Andrea suggested discussion of the use of the subject of "context", noting that context should be evolving. He suggested that projects that take years to complete be required to come back periodically with updates on progress. He asked if there was a vehicle that could be used in order to be able to review cases that are recommended to Council.

A discussion ensued regarding the difference between recommending an item to Council and approving an item. It was the general consensus that the Board would like to be able to have more time for appropriate input and suggestions to City Council with regard to recommendations.

Vice-Chairman Jones opined that the board needs to get beyond personal reaction to context; Scottsdale is changing and projects will be coming in that are clearly beyond context.

Mr. Gray suggested an annual meeting between the Development Review Board and the Planning Commission so that the vision can be discussed.

Councilman Ecton opined that the Board is creating the future and needs to consider what future generations will want before their own personal likes.

Councilman Ecton noted that if the DRB would like to review items after making recommendations to Council, they need to be careful in their wording to prevent confusion, because Council will have already made a decision.

In response to an inquiry by Councilman Ecton, Ms. Bronski noted that for now all art that can be seen by the public, whether inside or outside, is considered

public art. She noted that the provision is currently being reviewed by the arts coordinator in the downtown group.

Councilman Ecton opined that many of the public art issues will be clarified in the near future, because a committee has been appointed to work with the Cultural Council to help reconstruct the public art agreement and program.

A discussion ensued regarding signage, including architectural signage and construction trailers.

In response to an inquiry by Board Member O'Neill, Ms. Galav noted that application procedures are being revised because the process is being revised. She noted that staff is taking requests for additional context and staff will take it upon themselves to supply additional context. Mr. Gray suggested that staff will no longer process applications before the complete application is received, noting that the goal is to move applicants through the process as quickly as possible.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the study session of the Scottsdale Development Review Board adjourned at 3:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
A/V Tronics, Inc.